



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Handwritten initials

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,345	07/22/2003	Gregory J. Petras	WC01520-2	9776
28548	7590	05/10/2006	EXAMINER	
STONEMAN LAW OFFICES, LTD 3113 NORTH 3RD STREET PHOENIX, AZ 85012			ALI, MOHAMMAD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/624,345

Applicant(s)

PETRAS ET AL

Examiner

Mohammad Ali

Art Unit

2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 35,36 and 43-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 35,36 and 43-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the arguments filed 2/28/06.

Claims 35-36 and 43-85 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

2. After further search and a thorough examination of the present application claims 35-36 and 43-85 remains rejected.

Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 35-36 and 43-85 have been considered, but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

First, Applicant's argue that Plantec does not teach or suggest any kind of 'e-mail survey'.

In response to applicant's arguments the Examiner respectfully submits that Plantec teaches the particular limitation as, electronic information gathering to use of a virtual human interface to conduct surveys and collect and present survey results data, wherein the network is the Internet, the survey result report is a web page, and an Internet browsing application running on the third computer issues the request for the survey result report, see col. 1, lines 8-11 and col. 4, lines 20-22, Plantec.

Second, Applicant's argue that Plantec does not teach or suggest any kind of 'capture and storage of experience'.

In response to applicant's arguments the Examiner respectfully submits that Plantec teaches the particular limitation as, dynamic script file loading is used to facilitate adapting to a user's interests during a survey. The ability to load "storage" script files dynamically provides the additional advantage of breaking a larger script into

Art Unit: 2166

multiple component scripts to keep any single script relatively small, which, in turn, to reduce script download times. The reduced download times provided a better user experience, particular in circumstances -where transmission bandwidth is limited, see col. 26, lines 11-20, Plantec.

Third, Applicant's argue that Examiner has not "established a prima facie case of obviousness".

In response to applicant's argument on page 2, *a prima facie case of obviousness* is established when the teachings from the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Once such a case is established, it is incumbent upon appellant to go forward with objective evidence of unobviousness. In re Fielder, 471 F.2d 640, 176 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1973).

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification.

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Reference is made to MPEP 2144.01 - Implicit Disclosure

"[I]n considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." In re Preda, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968)

Subsequent to an analysis of the claims it was revealed that a number of limitations recited in the claims belong in the prior art and thus encompassed and/or implicitly disclosed in the reference (s) applied and cited. It is logical for the examiner to focus on the limitations that are "crux of the invention" and not involve a lot of energy and time for the things that are not central to the invention, but peripheral. The examiner is aware of the duties to address each and every element of claims, however, it is also important that a person prosecuting a patent application before the Office or an stakeholders of patent granting process make effort to understand the level of one of ordinary skill in the (data processing) art or the level one of skilled in the (data processing) art, as encompassed by the applied and cited references. The administrative convenience derived from such a cooperation between the attorneys and examiners benefits the Office as well the patentee.

In view of the above, the examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the claims have been addressed in this Action.

For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office action was proper.

In response to applicant's argument, to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

"Test of obviousness is not whether features of secondary reference may be bodily

incorporated into primary reference's structure, nor whether claimed invention is expressly suggested in any one or all of references; rather, test is what combined teachings of references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in art."

In re Keller, Terry, and Davies, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

"Reason, suggestion, or motivation to combine two or more prior art references in single invention may come from references themselves, from knowledge of those skilled in art that certain references or disclosures in references are known to be of interest in particular field, or from nature of problem to be solved;" Pro-Mold and Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics Inc. U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 37 USPQ2d 1626 Decided February 7, 1996 Nos. 95-1171, - 1181

"[q]uestion is whether there is something in prior art as whole to suggest desirability, and thus obviousness, of making combination." Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company et al. U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 221 USPQ 481 Decided Mar. 21, 1984 No 83-1178.

Fourth, Applicant's argue that none of the references teach Applicants 'set of natural-language terms to be rated as to relevancy to each subject'.

In response to applicant's arguments the Examiner respectfully submits that Plantec teaches the particular limitation as, a virtual human interface is a bridge between humans and technology built from artificial intelligence and natural language components. Because it recognizes and understands human communication on one side and technology communication on the other, the virtual human interface can translate meaning between the two. In the survey context, the virtual human interface

can ask questions in human terms, receive responses provided in human terms, translate the responses into machine terms, perform machine-based processing on the machine terms, and then translate the machine-processed information back into human terms for communication to a human. Plantec does not explicitly indicate claimed relevancy information. Goldstein remedy such kinds of deficiency by teaching there is details on how My-e-surveys 150 "Float" or any other relevant information. Surveys contained in My-e-surveys 150 may be categorized by subject and topic areas. Such categories may be selected by a consumer or customer submitting such a survey, or categories may be automatically determined through the use of natural language analysis or other text analysis means. In the event an automated text analysis is unable to categorize a given survey, My-e-surveys 150 staff can review a survey and assign it to an appropriate category or categories. Additional categories may be created by My-e-surveys 150 administrative staff based on customer or member requests, see paras. 0083, 0084. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because relevancy information of Goldstein's teaching would have allowed Plantec's system to achieve public opinions for their satisfaction as suggested by Goldstein at para 0002.

Fifth, in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references in page 3, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so

Art Unit: 2166

found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because relevancy information of Goldstein's teaching would have allowed Plantec's system to achieve public opinions for their satisfaction as suggested by Goldstein at para 0002.

Hence, Applicants' arguments do not distinguish over the claimed invention over the prior art of record.

In light of the foregoing arguments, the 103 rejections are hereby sustained.

Specification

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contents more than one paragraph. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b). Abstract should be single paragraph.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to because they fail to show necessary textual labels of features or symbols in Fig. 1-A as described in the specification. For example, placing a label, "a printer, a mouse", with elements 1-14, 1-16 of Fig. 1-A, would give the viewer necessary detail to fully understand this element at a glance. A *descriptive* textual label for *each numbered element* in these figures would be needed to fully and better understand these figures without substantial analysis of the detailed specification. Any structural detail that is of sufficient importance to be described should be shown in the drawing. Optionally, applicant may wish to include a table next to the present figure to fulfill this requirement. See 37 CFR 1.83. 37 CFR 1.84(n)(o) is recited below:
"(n) Symbols. Graphical drawing symbols may be used for conventional elements when appropriate. The elements for which such symbols and labeled representations are used must be adequately identified in the specification. Known devices should be illustrated by symbols which have a universally recognized conventional meaning and are generally accepted in the art. Other symbols which are not universally recognized may be used, subject to approval by the Office, if

Art Unit: 2166

they are not likely to be confused with existing conventional symbols, and if they are readily identifiable.

(o) Legends. Suitable descriptive legends may be used, or may be required by the Examiner, where necessary for understanding of the drawing, subject to approval by the Office.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 35-36 and 43-63 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plantec et al. ('Plantec' hereinafter), USP 6,826,540 in view of Michael Goldstein ('Goldstein' hereinafter), USPGPUB 2001/0032115.

With respect to claim 35,

Plantec teaches an Internet website client-server computer system, for use to determine by e-mail survey a level of subject approval for each one of a population of survey participants by capturing each such participant's opinions about the degree of relevance of each of a respective set of natural language terms to each of a respective set of subjects (see col. 8, lines 65 to col. 9, lines 7), comprising:

a) a client interface system arranged so that a survey taker may indicate at least i) a defined question for the survey, ii) a such set of subjects to be evaluated, iii) a such set of natural-language terms to be rated as to relevancy to each subject, iv) a participant audience, and v) a time-frame for response (see col. 8 lines 65 to col. 9, lines 2-7, Plantec);

b) a server computer processor system connected with said client interface system (see Fig. 1, Plantec); and c) a server computer software system, operational with said server computer processor system, arranged to provide survey processing comprising i) compiling a survey file and survey document in accordance with survey taker input, ii) communicating such survey document to such participant audience, and iii) receiving and tabulating responses (see col. 22, lines 36-40, Fig. 5E-F, Plantec).

Plantec does not explicitly indicate claimed relevancy information.

Goldstein teaches relevancy information at para 0017 and 0083.

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because

relevancy information of Goldstein's teaching would have allowed Plantec's system to achieve public opinions for their satisfaction as suggested by Goldstein at para 0002.

As to claim 36,

Plantec teaches displaying survey results at a publicized URL (see Fig. 1, col. 10, lines 35-37, Plantec).

With respect to claim 43,

Plantec teaches, an Internet client-server system for assisting at least one group of users having at least one common goal to capture and search, in a single database, offered knowledge, relevant to such at least one common goal, of a plurality of such users for the benefit of at least one of such users (see col. 8, lines 65 to col. 9, lines 7, Fig. 1-2), comprising: a) individually capturing for such database at least one experience of at least some of such plurality (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec);

b) storing in such database such experience (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec);
c) user-searching, using at least one natural-language word, to select at least one desired kind of stored experience (see col. 8, lines 65 to col. 9, lines 7, Fig. 1-2, Plantec);

d) performing such user-searching (see col. 17, lines 45-55, Plantec); and e) presenting search results (see Fig. 1, col. 17, lines 1-10, Plantec).

Plantec does not explicitly indicate claimed relevancy information.

Goldstein teaches relevancy information at para 0017 and 0083.

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because

relevancy information of Goldstein's teaching would have allowed Plantec's system to achieve public opinions for their satisfaction as suggested by Goldstein at para 0002.

As to claim 44,

Plantec teaches searchably capturing for such database at least one item of such knowledge selected from the group consisting essentially of a) user-advice b) opinions of experts c) people who can help d) miscellaneous such knowledge of users (see col. 8, lines 65 to col. 9, lines 7, Figs. 5E-F et seq, Plantec).

As to claim 45,

Plantec teaches a substantially automatic website management system (see Fig. 1, Plantec).

As to claim 46,

Plantec teaches automatically rewarding assisting users for website management assistance (see col. 8, lines 65 to col. 9, line 7 and Fig. 1, Plantec).

As to claim 47,

Plantec teaches a) providing a software management system to directly manage such database and such population of users essentially without outside management (see col. 17, lines 13-20, Plantec); and b) providing for variables in such software management system to be configurable without affecting such direct management operations (see col. 17, lines 13-20 and col. 18, lines 35-40, Plantec); c) wherein such software management system comprises i) measuring management efforts of each of at least one management sub-community (see col. 17, lines 13-20 and col. 4, lines 60-65, Plantec), ii) setting goals for each of such management community (see col. 22, lines

15-22, Plantec), and iii) managing a reward system to reward management efforts of each of such management sub-community (see col. 20, lines 25-40, Plantec).

As to claim 48,

Plantec teaches searchably capturing for such database such knowledge of users concerning useful knowledge sources outside such group of users (see col. 10 lines 19-25, Plantec).

As to claim 49,

Plantec teaches searchably capturing for such database such knowledge of users concerning useful knowledge sources outside such group of users (see col. 10 lines 19-25, Plantec).

As to claim 50,

Plantec teaches a) providing at least one capability for at least one user to complete on-line at least one multiple choice poll (see col. 16, lines 66 to col. 17, lines 5, Plantec); and b) providing at least one reward for such at least one user to completing such at least one multiple choice poll (see col. 17, lines 3-10, Fig. 1, Plantec).

As to claim 51,

Plantec teaches wherein: a) such common goal is sales-oriented (see col. 7, lines 35-39, Plantec); b) such group of users comprises sales personnel (see col. 10 lines 19-25 et seq, Plantec); and c) those receiving such benefit comprise sales personnel (see col. 10 lines 19-25, Plantec).

As to claim 52,

Plantec teaches wherein such step of user-searching, using at least one natural-language word, to select at least one desired kind of stored knowledge (see col. 8, lines 65 to col. 9, lines 7), further comprises: a) selecting, if any, such at least one kind of stored experience associated with chosen such at least one natural language word (see col. 8, lines 65 to col. 9, lines 7); b) selecting, if any, such at least one kind of stored experience in which the text of such at least one stored experience contains the chosen such at least one natural-language word (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec); c) selecting, if any, such at least one kind of stored experience in which the category of such at least one stored experience contains the chosen such at least one natural-language word (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec); and d) selecting, if any, such at least one kind of stored experience in which the title of such at least one stored experience contains the chosen such at least one natural-language word (see col. 26, lines 19-20 and Fig. 5E, Plantec).

As to claim 53,

Plantec teaches automatically managing a reward system to reward efforts of such at least one user (see col. 10, lines 19-20, Fig. 1 et seq Plantec).

As to claim 54,

Plantec teaches a) automatically measuring and storing each experience contribution, including users' comments made by each such at least one user (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec); b) assigning points to be accumulated for each such experience contribution (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec); c) automatically accumulating assigned points for each such experience contribution by each such at

Art Unit: 2166

least one user (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec); d) automatically reporting such points accumulated for each such experience contribution (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec); e) defining at least one criteria for awarding prizes based on such accumulated points (see col. 26, lines 19-20 et seq, Plantec); and f) automatically awarding prizes to such at least one user with accumulated points meeting such at least one criteria (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec).

As to claim 55,

Plantec teaches a) managing such database and such group of users essentially without customer website management (see col. 10, lines 20-25, Plantec); b) permitting at least one customer to configure a plurality of variables in such computer software for such managing of such database (see col. 10, lines 20-25, Plantec); c) automatically setting goals for each such user participating in at least one management community (see col. 10, lines 20-25, Plantec); and d) automatically managing a reward system to reward management efforts of each of such at least one user of such at least one management community (see col. 10, lines 20-25 and Fig. 1, Plantec).

As to claim 56,

Plantec teaches a) rating the relative overall value of each such at least one item of such experience according to the opinion of each of such involved subset of such population of users (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec); b) collecting comments about each at least one item of such experience according to the opinion of each of such involved subset of such population of users (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec); and c) associating, in such database, respective such ratings of relative overall value and

respective such collected comments with respective such at least one item of such experience (see col. 26, lines 19-20 and col. 10, lines 20-25, Plantec).

As to claim 57,

Plantec teaches automatically accumulating system operation data (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec).

As to claim 58,

Plantec teaches wherein such system operation data comprises: a) data about compliance with such set of performance goals for each of at least one involved subset of such population of users (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec); b) data about each type of such stored experience (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec); c) data about such reward system (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec); and d) data about interviews of each of such involved subset of such population of users (see col. 26, lines 19-20 and col. 10, lines 19-25, Plantec).

As to claim 59,

Plantec teaches permitting such at least one user to view successively more detailed levels of such automatically accumulated system operation data (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Fig. 1 et seq Plantec).

As to claim 60,

Plantec teaches a) requesting installation of at least one independent database access module onto the personal computer of such at least one user (see col. 10, lines 19-25, Plantec); b) permitting selection, using such independent database access module, of at least one category of such knowledge for display by such at least one

Art Unit: 2166

user (see col. 26, lines 19-20 and col. 10, lines 19-25, Plantec); c) automatically searching, using such at least one independent database access module, such database, without need of a browser, for at least one selected category of such knowledge from such database (see col. 22, lines 50-54, Plantec); and d) displaying, using such at least one independent database access module, found knowledge from such at least one pre-determined category of such knowledge from such database to such at least one user (see col. 26, lines 19-20, and Abstract, Plantec).

As to claim 61,

Plantec teaches a) displaying continuously at least one selected type of such pre-determined information from at least one pre-determined category of such knowledge from such knowledge stored in such database to such at least one user (see col. 26, lines 19-20, and col. 22, lines 50-54 Plantec); and b) scrolling a display of at least one selected type of such pre-determined information from at least one pre-determined category of such knowledge from such knowledge stored in such database to such at least one user (see col. 26, lines 19-20 et seq, Plantec).

As to claim 62,

Plantec teaches a) making specific requests for information from information stored in such database by such at least one user (see col. 22, lines 19-20, Fig. 1, Plantec).

As to claim 63,

Plantec teaches a) receiving at least one request for information from such at least one user (see col. 26, lines 19-20 and col. 2, lines 60-67, Plantec); b) storing such

at least one request for information (see col. 26, lines 19-20 and col. 2, lines 59-65, Plantec); c) notifying designated other such at least one user with particular expertise about such at least one request for information (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec); d) storing such at least one request for information and at least one response by such at least one user with particular expertise as such at least one experience (see col. 26, lines 19-20, Plantec); and e) notifying such at least one user, requesting information, of such at least one experience containing such at least one request and such at least one response (see col. 26, lines 19-20 and col. 1, lines 7-10, Plantec).

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is (571) 272-4105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30 am-6:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Mohammad Ali
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2166

MA
December 2, 2005